





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

READ AND CIRCULATE!

THE

FREE TRADE FALSEHOOD

THAT

"A TARIFF IS A TAX" EXPOSED.

FALSEHOOD EXPOSED—"A TARIFF IS A TAX."

So we are told by that style of "revenue reformers" who draw their inspiration from the American Free Trade League. Honest people may accept this falsehood for a time, but the League is "run" in the interest of foreign manufacturers and their importing agents—who want control of our markets—and of political demagogues. Never was a falsehood more bald and base than this constant assertion that a tariff is a tax added, not only to the prices of imports on which it is levied, but to all like articles we make or produce, so that our government gets a dollar while our "monopolists," or manufacturers, get ten dollars or more, and the people are fleeced without compensation. The Free Trade League and its agents—authors and repeaters of this falsehood—*dare not meet it, fair and square, in open discussion*, but dodge the statement and comparison of facts and figures, as such comparison would be fatal to their assertions, which are the foundation of their whole fabric.

Let all candid persons read, with thoughtful care, the impregnable facts in this brief tract.

G. B. STEBBINS.

DETROIT, Mich., August, 1871.

THE PEOPLE'S PICTORIAL TAXPAYER.

The New York Free Trade League are circulating gratuitously and extensively, through the American News Company, a sheet entitled "The People's Pictorial Taxpayer," purporting to illustrate, by various cartoons and pictures, the baleful effect of levying a tax on such foreign products as compete with our own. Its arguments are surrounded by the cards of Wm. Jessup & Sons, manufacturers of steel and importers of iron, Sheffield, England; of Congreve & Son, of New York, agents of the Toledo Steel-works of Sheffield, England; of A. B. Sands & Co., importers of drugs, one of whose members, Mahlon Sands, serves the Free Trade League disinterestedly as secretary; of John Clark, Jr., & Co., foreign manufacturers of spool cotton; of Van Wart & McCoy, the New York agents of Van Wart, Son & Co., of Birmingham, and a dozen other English manufacturing firms; of F. W. Harfold, hardware, Birmingham, England; of

Sampson & Bro., importers of foreign iron; of W. & G. Dutcher, of Sheffield, England, file and tool manufacturers; of Spear & Jackson, of Sheffield, England, steel saw makers, and of William Irving, of New York, agent for two foreign cutlery and edge-tool firms, and of William Shefflin, importer of drugs. Besides these are the cards of several foreign insurance companies. A noble set of backers, these, to teach American taxpayers what their true interests are! A number of these agencies are located in New York, on purpose to evade the payment of American taxes.

Mr. D. A. Wells said, in one of his reports, that many of these American agencies of English firms are established to evade the revenue, and the Congressional Committee on Manufactures report that their smuggling and evasion of duties often amounts to 20 per cent. It is sublime impudence for such men to assume to teach our people, through the American Free Trade League.

Such are the inspirers of "The Pictorial Taxpayer." Let us look at some of its contents:

The principal cartoon is entitled "How the tariff robs the farmer and every workingman to benefit the monopolists." What a holy sympathy these Sheffield iron-masters and New York smugglers have for the American farmers and workingmen! They make no complaint in their own names. It is the precious farmer and workingman who finds his advocate in the British tool-makers and iron lords!

How disinterested they are in circulating this sheet to put down our "monopolists," and enlighten our people!

We comment on a few allegations:

On a picture of a shirt is printed, "The farmer in the morning puts on his flannel shirt taxed 68 per cent.

This is LIE THE FIRST. There is no tax raising the price 68 per cent. The cost of wool and weaving makes up that of flannel, and if the wool tariff raises the price of wool, as it should by the free trade assertion about other articles, then the farmer is a "bloated monopolist." But let us see the price of flannels. A. T. Stewart, a great dealer in American and imported flannels, furnished the revenue de-

partment two years ago a table of prices of woolens in 1860 and 1869, wherein we find the finest opera flannels—Middlesex imported—averaged 47½ cents gold in 1860, and 50 cents currency, or 42 cents gold, in 1869. Coarse flannels, mostly made in this country, sold for 18 cents, gold, in 1860, and for 16 cents, gold, in 1869, or 19 in currency, and other grades in like proportion, at prices slightly lower in gold and a trifle higher in currency—for which currency we suppose the tariff is not responsible. But the farmer's wool averaged 31 cents in 1860, over 35 cents in 1869, and is still higher now, so that his fleeces would buy more flannel at the last date. Hence the "taxed 68 per cent." shirt is a bold and stupid lie.

We now come to LIE THE SECOND AND THIRD:

"Trousers taxed 60 per cent."

"Vest taxed 60 per cent."

There is no direct tax on vest or trousers, but the assumption is that certain duties have raised their price 60 per cent. The same return from A. T. Stewart shows that Middlesex doekins sold under free trade in 1860 for \$1.05 a yard, and under protective duties in 1869 for 96 cents in gold. Broadbrook cassimeres that sold in 1860 for \$1.75 sold in 1869 for \$1.46. Spring cassimeres that sold in 1860 for \$1.12½ to \$1.25 sold in 1869 for \$1.14. Glenham sackings that sold in 1860 for \$1.05 sold in 1869 for 98 cents; and so on throughout the list.

But some free traders will ask, how is the tariff protective if it does not raise the price? They might as well ask, "How is a fence protective if it does not raise the entire level of the lot?" If a tariff gives the American market to American producers it increases their sales, and on increased quantities sold they can afford lower prices than they could afford on small quantities.

The foundation falsehood from which these free trade lies come, as streams from a fountain, is that Congress, and not competition, fixes prices, and that if Congress lays a duty on the importation of an article, though it may never be imported, the free trade theory is that the price of the whole domestic supply is raised the amount of the duty. Suppose, for a moment, this were true, would the farmer lose more than he would gain by the existing tariffs? Let us see. The country imports about two per cent. of its butter as well as five per cent. of its pig iron. There is a tariff of four cents a pound on butter, from which the Government derived on the importation of 1869, of 6,685,093 pounds of butter, a revenue of \$267,403. The Protectionist sees that an importation of two per cent. cannot fix the price of a domestic product of 98 per cent., and he therefore affirms that the importers of this butter only got for it, after paying the duty, the same price they would have received had they paid no duty, viz.: the current domestic American price. The Canadians pay the duties themselves. But, on the free trade theory, the duty of four cents a pound raises the price of the 800,000,000 pounds made by us, so that, while the Government gets a revenue of \$267,403, the farmers—miserable butter "monopolists"—get an extra \$32,000,000 yearly. In the same way the tariff of 25 cents a bushel on potatoes and 15 cents on grain, gives the Government but a million dollars'

revenue, but the farmers get over \$400,000,000! Who believes this? The free trade theory is an absurdity and a lie.

Let us come back to the Pictorial Taxpayer and look up LIE THE FOURTH—an overcoat pictured out, and on it, "Cloth taxed 60 per cent."

A. T. Stewart returned Middlesex beaver at \$3.75 in 1860, and \$3.54 cents, in gold, in 1869, and goods used for overcoats are as low, at least, even in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and of home make, as in 1860. So the 60 per cent. tax added to the cost, is gone to the winds, for the tariff was lower in 1860 than now.

LIE THE FIFTH is a boot marked "Draws on his boots taxed thirty-five per cent."

In 1857, under a low tariff, our imports of boots and shoes were but \$127,650, while our exports were \$782,525, and our homemade \$91,889,000. In 1867, under a higher tariff, our total imports were but \$18,695, our exports \$681,000, and our homemade still very large. We have such control that tariffs hardly affect prices, much less raise them thirty-five per cent. and this lie is about the boldest of all.

LIE THE SIXTH, "Puts on some coal taxed sixty per cent." Much of the coal used for domestic purposes is the anthracite, on which there is no duty; the duty on bituminous coal is practically of no consequence a hundred and fifty miles from the sea coast, and in the West, where this lie is meant to tell, has no effect. Our imports of Nova Scotia coal are a little over one per cent. of our consumption, too small to govern prices, and it so happened that coal was higher, with free trade with Nova Scotia under the Reciprocity Treaty, for five years up to 1866, than it has been since, with the duty of \$1.25 in gold per ton. Thus this lie is disposed of, and our work, so far, with this free trade pictorial sheet, which answers the double purpose of telling lies to the people and advertising the business of the foreigners and their agents whose cards are on its margin, sums up as follows:

The farmer rises in the morning (true), puts on his flannel shirt, taxed 68 per cent. (false), and his trousers, taxed 60 per cent. (false), his vest, taxed 60 per cent. (false), and his overcoat, taxed from 40 to 150 per cent. (false), draws on his boots, taxed 35 per cent. (false), puts on some coal, taxed 60 per cent. (false)—

There is considerable "more of the same sort," the exposure of which would be needlessly tedious; for instance, a spade and an axe, each "taxed 35 per cent.," while our spades, shovels and axes compete with the English in their own colonies.

A knife and fork "taxed 35 per cent.," while they too compete with the English abroad, and the steel of which they are made is cheaper than it was in 1859, under a lower tariff then, but with none made in this country, and, of course, no competition to keep prices fair. When British steel-makers controlled our market their prices hardly varied for twenty years from 10c., 12½c. and 16c. for different grades, but, when *manufactories were started here*, in 1860, down went their prices to 9c., 10½c. and 13c., and 13½c. in gold was the price current in 1870 of the quality sold for 16c. through twenty years.

The Free Trade League had better get up decent honesty enough to state these facts in

their next pictorial, instead of the lie of a steel knife "taxed 35 per cent." by the tariff.

A very active competition is going on between foreign and American manufacturers of cutlery, and under our protective system the latter have been steadily driving the former out of our American markets. Our imports of cutlery fourteen years ago were \$2,140,000 per annum, while for the twelve months ending December 31, 1868, they were only \$1,530,550, or 25 per cent. less for a population 25 per cent. greater. On July 15, 1868, the Select Committee on Scientific Instruction reported to the British House of Commons that the manufacturers of the United States have wholly or largely superseded those of England in the common markets of the world, including the English colonies, in TABLEWARE, scissors, pen-knives, locks, horse-nails, coopers' tools, augers, adzes, axes, carpenters' broad-axes, gimlets, cut-nails, shoemakers' tools, and some twenty other kinds of similar cutlery and hardware. But the Free Trader will ask: "If we can sell cutlery cheaper than England, why not repeal the tariff? If we, by our forts, can secure our coasts against attack, what need remains of forts that are never to do any fighting?"

On the margin of this Pictorial Tax Payer are the advertisements of half a dozen makers of British cutlery. They want to trade with America without paying American taxes. That is "the milk in this cocoa-nut."

Under the large heading "The rich richer and the poor poorer," are two pictures, one of a comfortable "monopolist" in his easy-chair, gloat-ing over "A hundred per cent. dividend from my salt company, fifty per cent. from my thread company: that's what protection does for me;" and one of a poor sewing-woman in her garret, saying, "I have one blanket instead of two, my thread costs me twice as much, and coal is dear: that's what protection does for me."

If the League will tell who, when and where, in the last five years, has received, not a hundred or fifty per cent. on salt or thread stock, but a quarter as much on either, the lie on that side will be discounted so far. In the *Chicago Tribune*, of July 8, salt is quoted at \$2.10 to \$2.20 per barrel, and the *Tribune* is compelled to admit that it is as low as in 1860, but tries to deny that home competition has kept it down, even with a higher tariff or "tax."

The Pictorial says the farmer's salt is "taxed 108 per cent.," while he can't tell when he bought it for half, or much less than its present price, and that lie flies after the rest.

Out here in the West, the farmer's wool will exchange for blankets made in our western mills more to his advantage than ten years ago, that is, fewer pounds will buy as good a blanket. This thread lie may best be answered by quoting from a responsible correspondent of the *Hartford Post*. He said, in December, 1869:

"The average importation of spool-cotton into New York, for three consecutive years, ending June 30, 1861, was 6,685,200 dozen per annum, and, under a duty of 24 per cent. *ad valorem*, yielded a revenue to the Government of \$365,063.04 per annum.

"The importation of spool-cotton into New York in 1868 was 3,519,573 dozen; duties on the same, \$822,276.98.

"We have no data to show the importations of this article into other ports in the country,

but will suppose it to be 500,000, or the whole importation of the year to be 4,000,000 dozen; amount of American six-cord thread manufactured in 1863, 2,000,000 dozen; amount of American enameled thread manufactured, 8,000,000 dozen.

"It appears that not less than 14,000,000 dozen spool-cotton will be consumed in this country the present year, more than two-thirds of which is of American manufacture.

"Up to a late period, the foreign manufacturers controlled the price of thread in our market; at present the American manufacturers control the price.

"For two or three years after the decline in the price of gold to about its present value, the price of foreign thread remained steady at \$1.10 to \$1.15 per dozen; it is now selling at 80 to 90 cents per dozen—a decline in price of 30 cents per dozen in two years—which will be a saving to the consumers of foreign thread of \$1,200,000 the present year, while the decline in the American spool-cotton, owing to strong competition, has been reduced more than 50 per cent., which will show a still further saving of \$2,000,000. The following is a summary of the results of a high duty on spool-cotton: The revenue to the Government has been more than doubled; the American manufacture of thread has been largely increased, while the price of labor in these thread mills is still as high as during the war, and the consumers of thread are saving \$3,000,000 per annum, through the strong competition which has sprung up between the American and foreign manufacturers."

But enough of this "Pictorial Tax Payer," which surely taxes heavily the credulity of its readers, if they are unlucky enough to believe what it says and pictures forth. It is to be hoped those British advertisements on the margin of this remarkable sheet were paid for in some coin or currency better than the false stories which they surround and illustrate.—*The Bureau*.

FREE TRADE ARGUMENTS.

"Monopolists;" "pig iron;" "bloated monopolists;" "a tariff is a tax;" "the rich grow richer and the poor poorer;" "legalized robbery;" "coats and shirts taxed 70 per cent.;" "PIG IRON;" "salt;" etc., etc.; repeated backward, forward, sideways, any way for variety, long enough and loud enough, with a careful avoiding of any fact that might mar the effect.

"A BRINKERHOFF!!"

Not a falsehood, of course, not "a Roorback," but, greater yet, a Brinkerhoff! This Ohio agent of the Free Trade League, trying to prove a tariff a tax, said, "On pig iron and railroad iron the people last year paid a tax, in the increased prices and the duty, of \$45,000,000, of which Government got but \$5,000,000, and \$40,000,000 went into the pockets of the iron men."

The average wages in British iron mills are less than a dollar a day (see report of S. C. Hewitt, U. S. Commissioner to Paris Exposition), and in our mills two dollars. Suppose we had 200,000 men in our mills—a moderate estimate—in three hundred days they would

get \$60,000,000 a year *more wages* than the British workmen, and three-fourths of that goes to our farmers for food.

"That's where the money goes," and there's a Brinkerhoff for you!

NEW CENSUS.

HOW THE TARIFF IS RUINING THE COUNTRY.

INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS.

The following tables have been prepared at the Census Office in Washington:

Increase, per cent., in the number of Establishments of Productive Industry returned by Assistant Marshals in 1870 over the number returned in 1860:

Alabama.....	43	Minnesota.....	233
Arkansas.....	76	Mississippi.....	47
California.....	41	Missouri.....	242
Connecticut.....	73	Nebraska.....	332
Delaware.....	26	New Hampshire.....	25
Florida.....	263	New Jersey.....	59
Georgia.....	91	New York.....	59
Illinois.....	189	North Carolina.....	1
Indiana.....	111	Ohio.....	107
Iowa.....	235	Oregon.....	267
Kansas.....	334	Pennsylvania.....	64
Kentucky.....	48	Rhode Island.....	58
Louisiana.....	142	Tennessee.....	106
Maine.....	47	Vermont.....	69
Maryland.....	93	Virginia & W. Virginia.....	45
Michigan.....	173	Wisconsin.....	129
Massachusetts.....	62		

Increase, per cent., in the number of Farms returned by Assistant Marshals in 1870 over the number returned in 1860:

Alabama.....	22	Minnesota.....	154
Arkansas.....	7	Mississippi.....	49
California.....	19	Missouri.....	55
Connecticut.....	4	Nebraska.....	216
Delaware.....	19	New Jersey.....	16
Florida.....	50	New York.....	8
Georgia.....	2	North Carolina.....	21
Illinois.....	40	Ohio.....	7
Iowa.....	93	Oregon.....	40
Indiana.....	23	Pennsylvania.....	13
Kansas.....	257	Rhode Island.....	3
Kentucky.....	23	Tennessee.....	43
Louisiana.....	23	Vermont.....	8
Maine.....	4	Virginia & W. Virginia.....	18
Maryland.....	10	Wisconsin.....	51
Michigan.....	52		

WHAT DO WE IMPORT AND EXPORT?

What do we import? I have prepared a statement of commodities imported during the year ending June 30, 1870, amounting to \$462,356,163, as follows:

Free of duty.....	\$ 46,508,950
Coffee.....	24,233,766
Tea.....	13,871,546
Spices.....	1,513,118
Manufactured articles.....	376,228,783

Of this \$376,228,783 is in manufactured articles, employing over 800,000 persons in 500 trades.

To say that they consume \$100,000,000 worth of food is a moderate statement.

If they were here our farmers could furnish them their food at our doors, and save transportation; being in Europe they buy most of it

there, and we actually import their food in the shape of manufactures.

The leading staples which we export are raw cotton, food and gold. We import chiefly manufactures, but we export chiefly raw products. The following statement of imports and exports of raw products and manufactures will give a correct understanding of our foreign trade:

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS FROM 1858 TO 1869, INCLUSIVE.

	Exports.	Imports.
Raw products, . . .	\$3,798,924,706	\$1,610,271,837
Manufactures, . . .	452,874,058	2,418,012,842
Gold and silver, . . .	697,067,682
Total, . . .	\$4,748,866,446	\$4,028,284,679

We exported, beyond our imports, \$2,160,000,000 of raw products, and imported, beyond our exports, \$2,000,000,000 of manufactures. These manufactures represent a large addition by skill and labor to the value of raw products, and that addition should be made here, and thus increase our wealth.

DETROIT, Michigan.

M. W. FIELD.

FALSE AND TRUE REFORM OF REVENUE.

The American Free Trade League is at the bottom of the "revenue reform" cry. They propose to levy duties on tea, coffee, foreign drugs, sugar, etc., and to reduce as low as possible duties on the great staples we both import and manufacture, and the making of which employs a million or more of our people at wages better than in the Old World. To accomplish this they re-assert the exploded falsehood that "a tariff is a tax," paid by the consumer without compensation, helping Government a little and the "monopolists" far more. This falsehood—which they cannot prove and dare not discuss—is at the foundation of their plot, and their efforts are warmly approved and their success hoped for by *British manufacturers*, for the scheme of tariff for revenue only, ignoring protection, is in foreign interest and against American interests.

On the other hand the statement is made, and cannot be denied, that with our great need of revenue we must raise some \$140,000,000 yearly from tariff, which makes any large reduction impossible; that duties on tea, coffee, and all foreign products—on which there can be no home competition to lessen prices—add *permanently* to their cost, while duties on articles we both import and produce give us both revenue and protection, and the competition, at home and with foreigners, keeps prices reasonable, gives varied employment to labor and skill, increases internal wealth and home markets for the farmer, and is for the common good. It is further maintained that under the present tariff our revenues are larger than ever, and therefore it is a productive revenue tariff, and the country is growing in wealth, and there is no *pressing* need of a change. Yet reform is well and wise, and our tariff might be simplified, many articles added to the free list, specific duties put in place of *ad valorem*, coffee, tea, drugs and other foreign products made *free*, changes made in rates where plainly just and needed, and duties for both revenue and protection maintained on the great leading articles we import and produce or manufacture.

Our internal revenue taxes can be abolished,

save on spirits and tobacco, and a host of tax-gatherers dismissed to some more popular and productive employment.

These changes can be so adjusted as to reduce our tariff some \$30,000,000, and make safe reduction of taxes with an eye to our debt and expenses, and it does not seem very difficult for honest men to adjust revenue matters.

We must bear in mind, too, that the development of our resources, the employment of our people and the increase of our internal commerce and wealth, by the growth of our agriculture and manufactures together, is the only means whereby our large debt can be paid. These reforms are in American interest, not in foreign interests.

Let the people think and decide. On the one side a tariff on coffee, tea, sugar and other necessaries of foreign production, the scheme based on the falsehood that a tariff is a tax paid by the consumer.

On the other hand, coffee, tea and like products free, duties, to make revenue and protection allies, on our great staples, tariffs simplified and internal taxes well-nigh abolished. Which will you have?

WISCONSIN WOOL AND WOOLENS.

The last report of the Wisconsin Wool Growers' Association states that two million pounds of wool were used by the woolen mills of that State, most of which have been started in ten years, and are paying the farmer on the average more for his wool and selling him honest cloths cheaper than ten years ago. At a like rate of increase for ten years to come, in 1880 all the wool of Wisconsin will be used at home, and all the cloths made in their own mills; and the woolen manufacture now stands only third in their industries—flour and lumber excelling it.

We are told "a tariff is a tax," but here are good clothes kept by fair competition, built up under a tariff, at prices quite as low or lower than when such tariff was much less than now.

THE WOOL TARIFF.

A little *intelligent truth-telling* would be a refreshing novelty and a charming variety in the labored newspaper articles on free trade and revenue reform.

For instance, the *Cincinnati Gazette*, of March 23, says: "The protected wool growers find the price of wool depressed because the tariff has crushed the home manufacture of woolsens, and thus dried up the demand for wool while it has stimulated importations."

In 1860 our home manufactures of woolsens were \$68,865,963, and in 1868 they had been "crushed" up to \$175,000,000; while the importations were \$5,500,000 less in 1868 than in 1860, as we learn from an address of E. B. Bigelow, President of the National Wool Manufacturers' Association, whose statistics are from official sources.

"Ignorance is bliss;
'Tis folly (for the *Gazette*) to be wise."

There seems to be a great effort to "pull the

wool over people's eyes" on this woolen question.

A moderate minority of the New England wool manufacturers want free trade in wool (not woolsens, mark)—that is, protection for themselves, but not for the wool grower—and got up a circular a while ago on the subject which the Free Traders made a great noise about, and in behalf of which Asper, of Missouri, introduced a bill into Congress.

Now comes out a disclaimer, as follows, which it would be well for all journals to make a note of, and tell this new practice of "ways that are dark" to the people. Here is the document:

We, the undersigned, signers of an "Appeal by the Woolen Men to the Manufacturers and People of New England," published in the *New York Evening Post* and the *New York Economist*, enter our protest against said "appeal," which appeared in print very different from what it was represented to be by the person who presented it to us for signatures, and we would state that we are in favor of "Protection to Home Industry," and supporters of that policy which gives American markets to American producers.

Ashworth & Jones, Worcester, Massachusetts.
L. L. Hodges, Worcester, "
J. A. Hunt, Worcester, "
Albert Curtis, Worcester, "
B. James, Worcester, "
Eli Collier, Cherry Valley, "
J. R. Burlin, Cherry Valley, "
W. Bottomly, Cherry Valley, "
Baker & Larned, Auburn, "
Davis, Fales & Co., Ashland, "
Wm. A. Lowell, Millbury, "
Peter Simpson, Millbury, "

WHAT REVENUE REFORM MEANS.

I should rejoice if no man or woman in this country needed to work in a mill or factory or furnace, if we could hire other nations forever to do for us this baser, less skillful, and more hateful and injurious drudgery.—*Charles Nordhoff, of the N. Y. Evening Post.*

WHAT IS A TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY?

As our Free Trade friends, who advocate what they call revenue reform, make but a vague declaration of their purposes, it may be well to publish the scheme of revenue from customs proposed by Hon. D. A. Wells, Special Commissioner of Revenue, and found on page 130 of his report for the year 1869. It is as follows:

RECAPITULATION.

Articles of food and drink.....	\$82,500,000
Textiles and wares	38,000,000
Metals.....	15,000,000
Fancy goods.....	5,000,000
Drugs, chemicals and oils.....	1,500,000
Miscellaneous.....	2,000,000
Total.....	\$144,000,000

Of the first item, duties on articles of food and drink, Mr. Wells proposes to collect sixty millions of dollars from tea, coffee, sugar and molasses—articles which are more largely consumed by the laborer than by the millionaire. He is the petted favorite of the free trade revenue reformers, who seem to have no objection to duties, *per se*, even on necessities used by working people. They only object to duties levied on articles of English manufacture.

WOOL.

When wool was low, some two years ago, the free trade revenue reformers said the tariff had run the price down. Now wool is over 50 cents a pound. Has the same tariff run it up?

PIG-IRON TARIFF.

A great deal has been said about pig iron, as if the duty was very high. This is a great mistake. The duty has never been so low as it is now in sixty years, except for a short time. Here it is:

	Per Ton.
Under the tariff of 1816.....	\$10 00
Under the tariff of 1824.....	13 00
Under the tariff of 1828.....	10 00
Under the tariff of 1842.....	9 00
Under the tariff of 1846, about.....	7 00
Under the tariff of 1857.....	5 00
Under the tariff of 1861.....	9 00
Under the tariff of 1870.....	7 00

NEW YORK CITY

Would make four or five hundred millions a year by selling imported goods, and by banking. We, in the West, would make our own goods, do our own banking, and keep our wealth here, by putting farm and factory side by side at our homes.

IMPORTS, EXPORTS, DEBT, ETC.

By commercial report of the *New York Times*, of July 23, the total imports of foreign merchandise to that port for six months, up to July 1, were \$216,562,259, and the exports of produce and merchandise, for the same time, \$115,261,937, both in currency. Gold and silver were exported to the value of \$44,680,419, and, of course, our debt abroad increased. Reduce the tariff on articles we can manufacture, and levy duties on coffee and other foreign products, after the patent "Revenue Reform" plan of the Free Trade League, and we have less home-manufactures, more imports, more debt, more exports of gold and silver, and no prospect or hope of specie payment or a stable currency, and a financial "crisis" at the end.

WHY THIS NOISE?—FREE TRADE IMPRACTICABLE.

In this country free trade is an absurd impracticability, while in other countries it has been a calamity. Nobody supposes we can levy \$300,000,000 yearly from internal taxes, and it is granted that we *must* raise about \$140,000,000 from tariffs. No protectionist asks more than that this be raised by duties so adjusted as to make protection and revenue allies and helpers, as they really are.

This hue and cry is suspicious when we *cannot* make large reductions of our tariff unless we repudiate our debt.

THE SPIRIT OF FREE TRADE

Is one of assault, and of active, undermining, circumventing war upon every branch of American industry which competes with foreign. From all the free trade speakers with lynx eyes and pin-hole vision pour the incessant streams of sneers, gibes and hate upon American iron,

woolen, cotton, lumber, coal and salt industries, which produce a thousand millions of dollars a year, support one-third of our people directly, and which are indispensable to the other two-thirds. Not a single lie is conceivable against them that has not been told, nor a single sophistry which has not been used. On the other hand, the spirit of free trade toward British manufacturers is that of the grateful spaniel toward the benefactor who alternately caresses and kicks him. English pirates destroy our shipping, and then turn around brazenly and attribute its destruction to the tariff which protects our manufactures. "Aye! aye!" shout the Free Traders, "it is the tariff. Give the same ship-yards which destroyed our ships the monopoly of rebuilding them, and all is well!" This spirit of alliance between Free Traders and foreign manufacturers, and of hostility to our own American industries, is a spirit of despicable toadyism, only worthy of a nation of industrial lacqueys and slaves.—*The Bureau*.

DOES PROTECTION PROTECT? A PILL FOR THE FREE TRADE LEAGUE. WHERE IS D. A. WELLS? READ HOW THE TARIFF IS RUINING OUR INDUSTRIES.

Ryland's *Iron Trade Circular*, for March 4, 1871, published at Birmingham, England, makes the following confession, which is deserving of the attention of the American people:

"The edge-tool trade is well sustained, and we have less of the effects of American competition. That this competition is severe, however, is a fact that cannot be ignored, and it applies to many other branches than that of edge-tools. Every Canadian season affords unmistakable evidence that some additional article in English hardware is being supplanted by the produce of Northern States, and it is notorious how largely American wares are rivaling those of the mother country in other of our colonial possessions, as well as upon the continent. *The ascendance of the Protectionist party in the States continues to operate most favorably for the manufacturing interest there, and it is no wonder that, under such BENIGNANT AUSPICES, the enterprise in this direction is swelling to colossal proportions.* The whole subject is one demanding the serious attention of our manufacturers."

What will they do about it? Revenue Reform will have to be hurried up to save the Birmingham manufacturers from ruin. The trade journals in England and the English trade agents in the United States ought not to contradict each other so flagrantly. *Colonel Grosvenor*, of the *St. Louis Democrat*, who is not a modest man, or he would have dropped his military title after abruptly leaving the service, has written a book entitled "Does Protection Protect?" about which a mighty cackle is kept up by the Free Traders. We fancy that Ryland's *Trade Circular* has answered this question fully and effectively in the article above quoted.

The immaculate and most learned Grosvenor, late of the U. S. Army, later of the *Missouri Democrat*, latest of the Free Trade League, thinks protection does not protect, but these British manufacturers think it *does*, and they ought to know, for it comes home to their pockets.—*Industrial Bulletin*, May, 1871.

Mr. D. A. Wells, ex-Commissioner of Revenue, has spoken in Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago and Detroit, in April and May, on our "Financial and Industrial Condition." So far as we can learn, leading Free Traders have made a good deal of effort and flourish of trumpets to get up these meetings; and while he has assumed a judicial impartiality as between protection and free trade, his idea of "revenue reform" so agrees with that of the Free Trade League that all is well between them.

LOOSE ASSERTION AND CONTRADICTION STATEMENT.

Mr. Wells is given to many words, and not given to close or accurate statement of fact or argument, and much of his two hours' address, substantially the same everywhere, is made up of unimportant details on matters of minor moment.

So open to criticism as his loose mode of speech makes him, it is small wonder that he declined a proposal to discuss with Mr. Stebbins, in Detroit, and only offered the poor circumlocution of reply to written questions in some newspaper.

Let us look at some of his statements as samples of what others may be worth, and then at his programme.

Taking the period from the financial "crisis" of 1857 to 1860 (he did not mention that said "crisis" was the culminating result of a revenue tariff policy), he said:

"There was more hard work done, more real money earned and saved, and more true progress made in this country than in any three years of history before or since. Our population put the largest number of cotton spindles in motion of any corresponding period; constructed more miles of railway than at any previous time, and increased our consumption of foreign productions.

"Commerce flourished, ships were built, industry was diversified, and, what was more important, there was a continually increasing home and foreign market for our products of agriculture. And what was very singular is, that during these years the tariff averaged only from 11 to 14 per cent. on the aggregate of our imports, or from 18 to 20 per cent. on such portions of our imports as were dutiable."

In his report for 1868 Commissioner Wells said:

"Within the last five years more cotton spindles have been put into operation, more iron furnaces erected, more iron smelted, more bars rolled, more steel made, more coal and copper mined, more lumber sawed and hewn, more houses and shops constructed, more manufacturing of different kinds started, and more petroleum collected, refined and exported than during any equal period in the history of the country; and this increase has been greater, both as regards quality and quantity, than the legitimate increase to be expected from the normal increase of wealth and population."

In his report for 1869 he gave a like glowing picture of "crops in excess of any recent average;" "millions of acres" of wilderness reclaimed in the year, and more miles of railroads built than ever; "and from the Atlantic to the Pacific there are few who, except from physical ailment, need hunger for food or be idle for want of remunerative employment."

Here is prosperity with a low tariff, and again with a higher tariff; the first greatest, and then the last greatest, also—D. A. Wells being witness to both!

Mr. E. D. Mansfield, of Ohio, a veteran and able writer for the Cincinnati Gazette and other leading journals, has given the figures to show an increase of value of agricultural exports for the three years, 1868-70, over the three years, 1858-60, of 130 per cent., and a like comparison shows an increase of the aggregate commerce, for the same period, of 40 per cent., while population has increased but 25 per cent. He also says that Mr. Wells makes the tariff of 1857 too low.

Mr. Wells conveys the idea that ship-building has been ruined, but omits to tell that the decrease of ocean ship-building began under the low tariff, and that 813 vessels were built in 1857, and but 414 in 1859, or that more vessels were built in 1867-9 than in the three years from 1857. Our ocean ship-building has suffered, from the change from wood to iron ships, which are built cheap on the Clyde (with iron made at half the wages paid here, and government subsidies to British ocean steamers); but our internal marine, on lakes and rivers, and our coast-wise fleet have increased. Any wise measures to increase our ocean marine will not be complained of; but why should this vast growth of internal commerce and wealth, doubling the quantity and making the value near three-fold in ten years, of the articles carried over our railroads, and largely increasing our home marine, be quietly passed over?

On reading his sad report of the incompetence and unfitness for this great work of revenue reform, of our high officials in Treasury, Senate and House, the thought came up that D. A. Wells "still lives," and we may be saved; but such an omission as this, in a look at our financial and industrial condition, tempts us almost to class him with the Great Incompetents, and give up in utter despair!

Mr. Wells says that the United States "has increased its purchases from the Argentine Republic without material increase of its sales for the last ten years," this state of things being a sample of the effects of our tariff and taxes—both practically the same—and that "there is not a single nation on the globe with which our trade is commercially as favorable to us as ten years ago."

Mr. Mansfield finds from official sources:

Imports from Argentine Republic, 1858.....	\$2,725,215
Imports from Argentine Republic, 1870.....	6,414,650
Exports to Argentine Republic, 1858.....	522,500
Exports to Argentine Republic, 1870.....	2,281,200

An increase of 440 per cent. in our exports, and but 240 per cent. in our imports. This is "increase of purchases with no material increase of sales."

Mr. Wells held up before his audiences a table-knife of American manufacture, and praised the skill and machinery used by our makers of cutlery, but regretted they were taxed 60 per cent. by the tariff on the steel they used.

In 1867 the same Mr. Wells, as Commissioner, suggested a tariff on steel higher than on iron, and said: "It is represented that since the introduction of the manufacture here, in 1859, the price of similar foreign steel has been very considerably reduced by American competition." Turning from his testimony to the price current, and we find that, up to 1859, English steel had

varied little for twenty years—from 10 cents, 12½ cents and 16 cents for different grades—but these rates were reduced in 1860, when our steel manufactures were established, to 9 cents, 10½ cents and 13 cents, and the quality sold for twenty years, with a low tariff and no American competition, at 16 cents, was offered in 1870, with a higher tariff, for 13½ cents in gold. Yet Mr. Wells talks of 60 per cent. added to its cost by a tariff!

In his official report as Commissioner, in 1869, he stated the freight on pig-iron as "\$1.50 per ton for every hundred miles inland." Statements from well-known business men in St. Louis, Chicago, &c., and from the Western Transportation Company's office, in New York, were obtained by the Congressional Committee on Manufactures, and the result of the comparison may be best seen in the following table:

PLACES.	Miles.	Wells' Rates.	True Rates.
Montreal to Chicago...	760	\$11 40	\$2 60@3 00
New York to Detroit...	750	11 25	5 00
New York to Chicago..	800	13 35	5 00@6 00
New York to St. Louis.	1068	16 02	7 50@8 00
N. Orleans to St. Louis.	728	10 92	3 00@4 00

Accuracy and truth, indeed!

But these samples of unstained and conflicting assertion must suffice.

TARIFF A TAX.

Mr. Wells has this theory to support, and it can only be done by half statements, more deceptive than open falsehoods, and by concealing important facts. Why should he, and the Free Trade League, be so persistent in support of this theory? It is at the foundation of their pet scheme of a tariff for revenue only. The foundation is false, and the house they would build on it would be based on quicksand, and overwhelmed by the storm of a financial and industrial "crisis."

They seek to make the people believe that all tariffs are taxes, paid by the consumer, and adding themselves to the cost, not only of imported articles on which they are levied, but to that of like articles made here. And this addition has no compensation to balance it, but goes to the home manufacturer—a "monopolist"—far more than to the Government. Difference in wages here and abroad, home market for farmers, furnished by more than a million artisans and operatives and their families, addition to our internal wealth by the development of our resources, are kept in the shade, and the added costs of articles exaggerated, and the effect of home competition to decrease those costs ignored.

They would raise revenue by duties on tea, coffee, sugar, etc., mostly foreign products, and lower duties on the articles we both import and manufacture, and therefore say to the people, "A tariff on coffee is all paid to Government; but if you put a tariff on woollens, Government gets a dollar and the manufacturer gets ten dollars, and so on."

Woollens of most kinds are as low to-day as in 1860; but no matter, a tariff is a tax.

Steel is lower than in 1859; but no matter, the tariff adds 60 per cent. to the cost of steel for knife blades—D. A. Wells being witness.

Delaines are 15 per cent. lower, with a pretty stiff tariff, than ten years ago, with a lower tariff, and none made in this country; but a tariff is a tax.

Pig iron sold in this country at \$21 in 1850, but when England had broken down our competition by low tariff and selling us at cost until our mills had closed, pig iron went up to \$37, in 1854, with a "tariff for revenue;" but no matter, a tariff is a tax.

John Stuart Mill, the great English free trade theorist, says (Polit. Econ., Vol. 2, p. 417-18): "Those are, therefore, in the right who maintain that taxes (tariffs) on imports are partly paid by foreigners;" but a tariff is a tax, paid by the consumer only.

Wages in our iron mills are twice what they are in England, and, with British wages, we could undersell them, and iron is mostly cost of wages; but no matter, a tariff on iron is a tax for the benefit of the maker, a "monopolist," and his workmen get no benefit in high wages, the farmers get no benefit in higher prices and nearer markets, Government gets a dollar, and the "monopolist" gets ten or more.

The tariff on butter, cheese, potatoes, and grain pays Government less than \$2,000,000, but puts \$400,000;000 yearly into the pockets of greedy farmers—basest and most powerful of "monopolists;" for a tariff is a tax, adding itself to costs of all articles—so we are told.

Ryland's *Trade Circular* of March, in Birmingham, England, says of the edge-tool trade:

"American competition is severe, and applies to hardware as well. * * * It is notorious how largely American wares are rivaling those of the mother country in our colonies as well as on the continent. The ascendance of the protection party in the United States operates most favorably for the manufacturing interest here. The subject demands the serious attention of our manufacturers."

Their manufacturers are paying "serious attention" to these efforts of the Free Trade League, D. A. Wells and others, and the *London Mining Journal* says: "If the League succeeds, we shall have a very large trade with the United States."

FREE TRADE "REVENUE REFORM."

Mr. Wells claims that his scheme of a tariff on tea, coffee, sugar, etc., and 35 per cent. on luxuries, running down to 15 per cent. on articles of comfort or necessity, with great raw materials (including the farmer's wool, of course) on the free list—in short a tariff for revenue only, ignoring protection, and thus really discriminating *against* ourselves and *in favor* of foreigners—would enable our manufacturers to do more, and benefit all. What British manufacturers want is our market, with fewer manufacturers here, and if they thought this revenue tariff scheme would increase our manufactures they would oppose it; but they favor it, and that tells the whole story—it is *in their interest, not in ours*.

Mr. Wells has made his four long speeches, and they will be read with some satisfaction, perhaps, by the managers of the Free Trade League in New York, and by British traders and manufacturers in Liverpool and Manchester, although those parties may wish he had been more guarded in assertion, if not more clear in statement.—*The Bureau*. G.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C031265126

